

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 8, 2004, claims 1–4, 9–17 and 22–24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,768 to *Leung et al* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,768 to *Berenson et al*. Also, claims 5–8 and 18–21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Leung* in view of *Berenson*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,666,528 to *Thai*.

Claims 1, 9, 14 and 22 are amended to recite, “encoding an access request statement from an application into a structured query language statement with a JDBC,” and claim 12 now includes, “receiving a structured query language statement generated by a JDBC from an access request statement of an application.” Support for the amendment is found in the specification at page 2, lines 7–9. Claims 1–24 remain pending in the application and reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

A. The Rejection of The Claims under § 103(a)

Claims 1–4, 9–17 and 22–24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Leung* in view of *Berenson*. In addition, claims 5–8 and 18–21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Leung* in view of *Berenson*, and further in view of *Thai*. The rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the amendment.

As noted above, claims 1, 9, 14 and 22 are amended to recite:
encoding an access request statement from an application
into a structured query language statement with a JDBC.

In addition, claim 12 includes, “receiving a structured query language statement generated by a JDBC from an access request statement of an application.” This element is neither described nor suggested by the references. Neither *Leung*, *Berenson* nor *Thai* describe encoding an access

Appl. No. 09/902,274
Resp. dated January 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of January 8, 2004

request statement from an application into an SQL statement using Java Database Connectivity (JDBC).

Accordingly claims 1, 9, 12, 14 and 22, as amended, are neither described nor suggested by *Leung* in view of *Berenson*, or *Leung* and *Berenson* in futher view of *Thai*. Claims 2–8, 10–11, 13, 15–21 and 23–24 depend from claims 1, 9, 12, 14 and 22, respectively, and include all the elements of the claim from which they depend. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under § 103(a) over *Leung* in view of *Berenson*, and *Leung* and *Berenson* in futher view of *Thai*, is respectfully requested.

B. Conclusion

In view of all of the above, claims 1–24 are believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fees are believed to be required with this Response, and should any be required, please charge Deposit Account 50-1123. Should any extension of time be required, please consider this a petition therefore and charge the required fee to Deposit Account 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

January 21, 2004


Eugene J. Bernard, Reg. No. 42,320
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5909 (telephone)
(303) 899-7333 (facsimile)